

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 25, 2007 has been carefully considered.

Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 17, 19-22, and 24-35 were previously canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

The First 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-13, 15, 16, 18, 23 and 36-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sawyer¹ in view of Saari,² among which claims 1, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 23 are independent claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.),

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure.³

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

A method for accounting for network usage comprising:
obtaining accounting start-stop event data from two or more accounting servers via an information bus, wherein the information bus contains the accounting start-stop event data published by the two or more accounting servers;
obtaining network flow data independent from said accounting start-stop event data from two or more routers within a network through intermediary netflow collectors, said network flow data including data regarding the number and type of packets utilized by a user; and

¹ U.S. Patent No. 5,828,737 to Sawyer.

² U.S. Patent No. 6,338,046 to Saari.

³ M.P.E.P § 2143.

correlating said accounting start-stop event data and said network flow data into a subscriber specific call detail record unique to said user by matching said accounting start-stop event data associated with said user with said network flow data associated with said user.

The Examiner states:

... Sawyer discloses a method for accounting for network usage comprising:

- obtaining accounting start-stop event data from an accounting server (column 5, lines 16-17; column 6, lines 45-47; figure 4; call start, call over; the processing device 42 associated with billing center 44 keeps connect/disconnect events);

- obtaining network flow data independent from the accounting start-stop event data from a router within a network through an intermediary netflow collector, the network flow data including data regarding the number and type of packets utilized by user (column 3, lines 61-63; column 4, lines 51-67; the bandwidth data (i.e., amount of data packets transferred over the network) is collected by the a bandwidth use monitoring device (BUMD) 40); and

- correlating the accounting start-stop event data and the network flow data into a subscriber specific call detail record unique to the user by matching the accounting start-stop event data associated with the user with the network flow data associated with the user (column 4, line 59-column 5, line 55; the proper connect/disconnect information is combined with its bandwidth information to determine a charging amount to be billed for each call, and is sent to the billing center to generate a bill for the usage, "subscriber specific call detail record" is nothing more the user's usage record to generate the bill).

Sawyer does not disclose accounting start-stop event data is obtained from two or more accounting servers via an information bus, wherein the information bus contains the accounting start-stop event data published by the two or more accounting servers; and network flow data is obtained from two or more routers. However, Saari discloses "accounting start-stop event data is obtain from two or more accounting servers via an information bus, wherein the information bus contains the accounting start-stop event data published by the two or more accounting servers; and network flow data is obtained from two or more routers." See Saari figures 2-3, column 4, line 43column 5, line 67 and column 6, line 50-column 7, line 25, "accounting start-stop event data is obtain from two or more accounting servers via an information bus" (two or more nodes 24a, 24b, 24c, 24d, include Timer 39 for obtaining the duration of time of the connection), "wherein the information bus contains the accounting start-stop event data published by the two or more accounting servers" (the nodes transmit the connection cost information to the network billing system 40), "network flow data is obtained from two or more routers" (the connection information 38 includes traffic parameters, connection type, number of bytes of data transferred, etc., is obtained from two or more billing unit 34a, 34b, 34c, 34d). Moreover, Saari also discloses the accounting start-stop event data is published by the two or more accounting servers (see figures 2-3 and column 5, lines 47-55, the charging information is transmitted to the external billing system 40). It is note that the

term "publish" is defines as "to make data available so that it may be read by another person or computer program" (see "The New Penguin dictionary of Computing" by Dick Pountain, "publish", submitted by the applicant). Thus, in Saari, the nodes 24a, 24b make charging information available to the external billing system 40, or the nodes 24a, 24b publish charging information to the external billing system 40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Sawyer's to adopt the teaching of Saari above, for the purpose of enabling the account information to be received, computed, and transmitted from/to multiple servers, thus allows the system to track the user's connection information when the user visits different information sources over the network..⁴

The Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons set forth below.

Sawyer In View Of Saari Does Not Disclose Or Suggest Obtaining Network flow Data Independent From Said Accounting Start-Stop Event Data From Two Or More Routers Within A Network Through Intermediary Netflow Collectors, Said Network Flow Data Including Data Regarding The Number And Type Of Packets Utilized By A User.

Contrary to the Examiner's statement, Sawyer in view of Saari does not disclose or suggest obtaining network flow data independent from said accounting start-stop event data from two or more routers within a network through intermediary netflow collectors, said network flow data including data regarding the number and type of packets utilized by a user as required by Claim 1. Sawyer discloses *estimating* the total amount of bandwidth used during each communication. The Abstract of Sawyer recites:

...measurements of the maximum amount of bandwidth used during predetermined time intervals are made during the course of each communication, with the maximum bandwidth measurements being summed to determine an *estimate* of the total amount of bandwidth used during the communication. The charge for the communication is then determined by multiplying the *estimated* total bandwidth measurement by a charging rate multiplier.⁵

The "Summary of the Invention" of Sawyer states:

... periodic instantaneous bandwidth use measurements are made during the course of each communication. The periodically made bandwidth use measurements are summed to determine an *estimate* of the total amount of bandwidth used to carry the communication. A charging rate multiplier is then

⁴ Office Action dated January 25, 2007, pp. 1-5.

⁵ Sawyer, Abstract. (emphasis added)

applied to the determined total bandwidth to obtain the charge incurred for the communication.⁶

Sawyer states further:

The communications system 10 further includes a bandwidth use monitoring device (BUMD) 40 connected to either one or both of the nodes 12 and 14 and operable to make measurements for each communication carried over the communications link 18 of the instantaneous amount of bandwidth being used by the communication. The measurements may be made by the device 40 on either or both the reverse and/or the forward portions of the communications link 18. The results of these measurements are output to a processing device 42 associated with a billing center 44 for the system 10 that sums the bandwidth use measurements to derive an *estimate* of the total bandwidth usage amount for each communication. The bandwidth use monitoring device 40 and processing device 42 accordingly function as a bandwidth meter 46 measuring the total amount of bandwidth used for each communication. The processing device 42 then further functions to multiply the *derived* total bandwidth usage amounts by a charging rate to determine a charging amount to be billed for each communication, with the determined charging amount reported to the billing center 44 for the addition of other charge items and the generation of a bill to the user.⁷

Sawyer states further:

The cellular telephone system 20 of FIG. 2 includes a similar functionality for determining a charging amount to be billed for each cellular telephone call. The mobile switching center 30 includes or is connected to a bandwidth use monitoring device 40 operable to make measurements, for each call carried over the air interface 26, of the instantaneous amount of bandwidth being used for the call. These measurements may be made by the device 40 on either or both the uplink and/or the downlink portions of the air interface 26. The results of these periodically made, instantaneous measurements are output to a processing device 42 associated with a billing center 44 for the cellular system 20 that sums the bandwidth use measurements to derive an *estimate* of the total bandwidth usage amount for each call. The bandwidth use monitoring device 40 and processing device 42 accordingly function as a bandwidth meter 46 measuring the total amount of bandwidth used for each call. The processing device 42 then further functions to multiply the *derived* total bandwidth usage amounts by a charging rate to determine a charging amount to be billed for each communication, with the determined charging amount reported to the billing center 44 for the addition of other charge items and the generation of a bill to the subscriber.⁸

⁶ Sawyer at col. 2 ll. 1-19. (emphasis added)

⁷ Sawyer at col. 4 l. 51 to col. 5 l. 5. (emphasis added)

⁸ Sawyer at col. 5 ll. 6-28. (emphasis added)

Thus, Sawyer discloses *estimating* the total amount of bandwidth used during each communication by summing the results of periodic instantaneous bandwidth use measurements. As such, the network flow data in Sawyer does not include data regarding the number and type of packets utilized by a user as required by Claim 1.

Sawyer Teaches Away From Claim 1.

Claim 1 requires that the network flow data include data regarding the number and type of packets utilized by a user. Whereas Sawyer teaches away from including in network flow data the number of packets used by a user, referring to such methods as “not particularly accurate.”

Sawyer recites:

One solution to this charging concern is to charge the user based on the amount of packets of information in all of the packet transmissions 36 transmitted over the course of the communication. The use of packet amounts as the primary factor in determining the charge to be billed is also not particularly accurate in bandwidth-on-demand type communications systems because a user would be charged the same amount for a ten kilobyte packet transmission regardless of the length of the communication. This charging scheme accordingly does not take into account the minimum level (Min) of bandwidth used in maintaining the communication over the communications link 18 or the air interface 26 in between instances of successive packet transmissions 36. Even though minimal in nature, use of that minimum amount of bandwidth affects the capability (i.e., capacity) of the system to simultaneously handle other communications and thus should be reflected in the charge billed to the user for making the communication or call.⁹

For this additional reason, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of Claim 1 is unsupported by the art.

Thus, a *prima facie* case has not been established and the rejection must be withdrawn.

Sawyer In View Of Saari Does Not Disclose Or Suggest Correlating Said Accounting Start-Stop Event Data And Said Network Flow Data Into A Subscriber Specific Call Detail Record Unique To Said User By Matching Said Accounting Start-Stop Event Data Associated With Said User With Said Network Flow Data Associated With Said User.

⁹ Sawyer at col. 4 ll. 33-50. (emphasis added)

As mentioned above, Sawyer in view of Saari does not disclose or suggest said network flow data including data regarding the number and type of packets utilized by a user as required by Claim 1. Therefore, Sawyer in view of Saari cannot be said to disclose or suggest matching accounting stop-start event data associated with said user with such network flow data associated with said user. For this additional reason, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of Claim 1 is unsupported by the art. Thus, a *prima facie* case has not been established and the rejection must be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-12

Claims 2-12 depend from Claim 1. Claim 1 being allowable, Claims 2-12 must also be allowable.

Claim 2

Claim 2 recites:

The method of claim 1 wherein said obtaining accounting start-stop event data further comprises:
parsing said accounting start-stop event data from the two or more accounting servers on a prescribed time interval; and
publishing said accounting start-stop event data on an information bus.

The Examiner states:

... Sawyer discloses wherein the obtaining accounting startstop event data further comprises: parsing the accounting start-sop event data from the accounting server on a prescribed time interval; and publishing the accounting start-stop event data on an information bus (column 5, lines 16-17; column 6, lines 45-47; figure 4; call start, call over; the processing device 42 associated with billing center 44 keeps connect/disconnect events).¹⁰

The Applicants respectfully disagree. Contrary to the Examiner's statement, Sawyer does not disclose wherein said obtaining accounting start-stop event data further comprises parsing said

¹⁰ Office Action, p. 5.

accounting start-stop event data from the two or more accounting servers on a prescribed time interval as required by Claim 2. In support of the Examiner's statement, the Examiner refers to portions of Sawyer that disclose periodically performing instantaneous rate calculations. The Applicants respectfully submit that equating periodically performing instantaneous rate calculations with parsing said accounting start-stop event data from the two or more accounting servers on a prescribed time interval, is improper. For this additional reason, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of Claim 2 is unsupported by the art.

Also contrary to the Examiner's statement, Sawyer does not disclose wherein said obtaining accounting start-stop event data further comprises publishing said accounting start-stop event data on an information bus as required by Claim 2. The Examiner's statement regarding the rejection of Claim 2 is inconsistent with the Examiner's rejection of Claim 1, wherein the Examiner states:

Sawyer does not disclose accounting start-stop event data is obtained from two or more accounting servers via an information bus, wherein the information bus contains the accounting start-stop event data *published* by the two or more accounting servers ...¹¹

For this additional reason, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of Claim 2 is unsupported by the art.

Thus, a *prima facie* case has not been established and the rejection must be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 4

Claim 3 recites:

The method of claim 1 wherein said obtaining accounting start-stop event data further comprises:
collecting said accounting start-stop event data at a target device that subscribes to said accounting start-stop event data.

¹¹ Office Action, p. 3. (emphasis added)

Claim 4 recites:

The method of claim 2 wherein said obtaining accounting start-stop event data further comprises:
collecting said accounting start-stop event data at a target device that subscribes to said accounting start-stop event data.

The Examiner states:

... Sawyer discloses wherein the obtaining accounting start-stop event data further comprises: collecting the accounting start-stop event data at a target device that subscribes to the accounting start-stop event data (column 5, lines 15-16 and column 6, lines 7-60; the connect/disconnect events is collected by the processing device 42 associated with the billing center 44).¹²

The Applicants respectfully disagree. Contrary to the Examiner's statement, Sawyer does not disclose collecting said accounting start-stop event data at a target device that subscribes to said accounting start-stop event data as required by Claims 3 and 4. In support of the Examiner's statement, the Examiner refers to portions of Sawyer that disclose outputting measurements to a device. The Applicants respectfully submit that the fact that data or measurements are output to a device does not require that the device subscribe to the data or measurements. For this additional reason, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of Claims 3 and 4 is unsupported by the art. Thus, a *prima facie* case has not been established and the rejection must be withdrawn.

Claim 5

Claim 5 recites:

The method of claim 1 wherein said obtaining network flow data further comprises:
aggregating said network flow data at said intermediary netflow flow collector according to a service provider defined aggregation scheme.

The Examiner states:

... Sawyer discloses wherein the obtaining network flow data further comprises: aggregating the network flow data at the intermediary netflow collector according

¹² Office Action, p. 5.

to a service provider defined aggregation scheme (column 4, lines 50-67; the bandwidth data is collected by the BUMD 40).¹³

The Applicants respectfully disagree. Contrary to the Examiner's statement, Sawyer does not disclose wherein said obtaining network flow data further comprises aggregating said network flow data at said intermediary netflow flow collector according to a service provider defined aggregation scheme as required by Claim 5. In support of the Examiner's statement, the Examiner refers to the operation of BUMD 40, but nowhere does the cited portion of Sawyer refer to aggregating said network flow data *according to a service provider defined aggregation scheme*. For this additional reason, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of Claim 5 is unsupported by the art. Thus, a *prima facie* case has not been established and the rejection must be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 8

Claim 7 recites:

The method of claim 5 wherein aggregating said network flow data further comprises:
basing aggregation of said network flow data on the Internet Protocol Layer 3 source address.

Claim 8 recites:

The method of claim 5 wherein aggregating said network flow data further comprises:
basing aggregation of said network flow data on the Internet Protocol Layer 4 destination address.

The Examiner states:

... Sawyer does not disclose basing aggregation of the network flow data on the Internet Protocol Layer 3 source address and the Internet Protocol Layer 4 destination address. However, basing aggregation of the network flow data on the Internet Protocol Layer 3 source address and the Internet Protocol Layer 4 destination address is well-known in the art of data communication using Internet Protocol. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the

¹³ Office Action, p. 5.

art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature above with Sawyer's for the purpose of applying the measurements of bandwidth data on the Internet Protocol Layer 3 source address and the Internet Protocol Layer 4 destination address.¹⁴

The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner admits that Sawyer does not teach basing aggregation of said network flow data on the Internet Protocol Layer 3 destination address or the Internet Protocol Layer 4 destination address, but does not provide a specific reference where such limitations are found, instead arguing that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify the invention in Sawyer to arrive at the additional claim limitation.

Therefore, the Applicants assume that the Examiner intended to take official notice of facts under M.P.E.P. § 2144.03 that the rationale supporting the obviousness rejection is based on common knowledge in the art or "well-known" prior art. Under M.P.E.P. § 2144.03, "[i]f the applicant traverses such an assertion the examiner should cite a reference in support of his or her position."

The Applicants hereby traverse the assertion and requests that a reference be cited in support of the position outlined in the Office Action. For this additional reason, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of Claims 7 and 8 is unsupported by the art. Thus, a *prima facie* case has not been established and the rejection must be withdrawn

Claims 9 and 11

Claim 9 recites:

The method of claim 1 wherein said obtaining network flow data further comprises:
filtering said network flow data at the intermediary netflow collector according to a service provider defined filtration scheme.

Claim 11 recites:

¹⁴ Office Action, pp. 5-6.

The method of claim 10 wherein said obtaining network flow data further comprises:
filtering said network flow data according to a service provider defined filtration scheme.

The Examiner states:

... Sawyer discloses wherein the obtaining network flow data further comprises: filtering the network flow data at the network flow collector according to a service provider defined filtration scheme (column 4, lines 57-59 and column 5, lines 12-15; the measurements of bandwidth data may be made by the BUMD 40 on either or both the reverse and/or the forward portions of the communications link 18).¹⁵

The Applicants respectfully disagree. Contrary to the Examiner's statement, Sawyer does not disclose filtering said network flow data according to a service provider defined filtration scheme as required by Claims 9 and 11. In support of the Examiner's statement, the Examiner refers to the operation of BUMD 40, but nowhere does the cited portion of Sawyer refer to filtering said network flow data *according to a service provider defined filtration scheme*. For this additional reason, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of Claims 9 and 11 is unsupported by the art. Thus, a *prima facie* case has not been established and the rejection must be withdrawn.

Claim 12

Claim 12 recites:

The method of claim 1 wherein said correlating said accounting start-stop event data and said network flow data further comprises:
reformatting said call detail record to meet post-correlated applications.

The Examiner states:

... Sawyer does not disclose wherein correlating and accounting start-stop event data and the network flow data further comprises: reformatting the call detail record to meet post-correlated applications. However, reformatting the call detail record to meet a compatible software application is wellknown in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the

¹⁵ Office Action, p. 6.

time of the invention was made to include the feature above with Sawyer's for the billing purpose.¹⁶

The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner admits that Sawyer does not teach wherein said correlating said accounting start-stop event data and said network flow data further comprises reforming said call detail record to meet post-correlated applications, but does not provide a specific reference where such limitations are found, instead arguing that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify the invention in Sawyer to arrive at the additional claim limitation. Therefore, the Applicants assume that the Examiner intended to take official notice of facts under M.P.E.P. § 2144.03 that the rationale supporting the obviousness rejection is based on common knowledge in the art or "well-known" prior art. Under M.P.E.P. § 2144.03, "[i]f the applicant traverses such an assertion the examiner should cite a reference in support of his or her position." The Applicants hereby traverse the assertion and requests that a reference be cited in support of the position outlined in the Office Action. For this additional reason, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of Claim 12 is unsupported by the art. Thus, a *prima facie* case has not been established and the rejection must be withdrawn

Claim 13

Claim 13 recites:

A method for accounting for network usage comprising:
parsing accounting start-stop event data from an accounting server on a prescribed time interval;
publishing said accounting start-stop event data on an information bus;
collecting network flow data independent from said accounting start-stop event data from a network router and forwarding said network flow data to a network flow collector, said network flow data including data regarding the number and type of packets utilized by a user;
aggregating said network flow data according to a prescribed aggregation scheme;
parsing said network flow data from said network flow collector;
publishing said network flow data on an information bus;

¹⁶ Office Action, p. 7.

collecting said accounting start-stop event data and said network flow data at a target device that subscribes to said accounting start-stop event data and said network flow data along with accounting start-stop event data from a different accounting server and network flow data from a different router; and correlating said accounting start-stop event data and said network flow data into a subscriber specific call detail record unique to said user by matching said accounting start-stop event data associated with said user with said network flow data associated with said user.

The Examiner states:

... Sawyer discloses a method for accounting for network usage comprising:

- parsing accounting start-stop event data from an accounting server on a prescribed time interval (column 5, lines 16-17; column 6, lines 45-47; figure 4; call start, call over; the processing device 42 associated with billing center 44 keeps connect/disconnect events);

- collecting network flow data independent from the accounting start-stop event data from a router within a network through an intermediary netflow collector, the network flow data including data regarding the number and type of packets utilized by user (column 3, lines 61-63; column 4, lines 51-67; the bandwidth data (i.e., amount of data packets transferred over the network) is collected by the a bandwidth user monitoring device (UBMD) 40);

- aggregating the network flow data according to a prescribed aggregation scheme (column 4, lines 57-60);

- parsing the network flow data from the network flow collector (column 4, lines 60-67);

- publishing the network flow data on an information bus (column 5, lines 10-15); collecting the accounting start-stop event data and network flow data at a target device that subscribed to the accounting start-stop event data and the network flow data (column 5, lines 29-55; the connect/disconnect events and bandwidth data are collected by the processing device 42 associated with the billing center 44); and

- correlating the accounting start-stop event data and the network flow data into a subscriber specific call detail record unique to the user by matching the accounting start-stop event data associated with the user with the network flow data associated with the user (column 4, line 59-column 5, line 55; the proper connect/disconnect information is combined with its bandwidth information to determine a charging amount to be billed for each call, and is sent to the billing center to generate a bill for the usage, "subscriber specific call detail record" is nothing more the user's usage record to generate the bill).

Sawyer does not disclose accounting start-stop event data is obtained from two or more accounting servers via an information bus, wherein the information bus contains the accounting start-stop event data published by the two or more accounting servers; and network flow data is obtained from two or more routers, publishing the accounting start-stop event data on an information bus. However, Saari discloses "accounting start-stop event data is obtain from two or more accounting servers via an information bus, wherein the information bus contains

the accounting start-stop event data published by the two or more accounting servers; and network flow data is obtained from two or more routers." See Saari figures 2-3, column 4, line 43-column 5, line 67 and column 6, line 50-column 7, line 25, "accounting start-stop event data is obtain from two or more accounting servers via an information bus" (two or more nodes 24a, 24b, 24c, 24d, include Timer 39 for obtaining the duration of time of the connection), "wherein the information bus contains the accounting start-stop event data published by the two or more accounting servers" (the nodes transmit the connection cost information to the network billing system 40), "network flow data is obtained from two or more routers" (the connection information 38 includes traffic parameters, connection type, number of bytes of data transferred, etc., is obtained from two or more billing unit 34a, 34b, 34c, 34d). Moreover, Saari also discloses the accounting start-stop event data is published by the two or more accounting servers (see figures 2-3 and column 5, lines 47-55, the charging information is transmitted to the external billing system 40). It is note that the term "publish" is defines as "to make data available so that it may be read by another person or computer program" (see "The New Penguin dictionary of Computing" by Dick Pountain, "publish", submitted by the applicant), Thus, in Saari, the nodes 24a, 24b make charging information available to the external billing system 40, or the nodes 24a, 24b publish charging information to the external billing system 40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Sawyer's to adopt the teaching of Saari above, for the purpose of enabling the account information to be received, computed, and transmitted from/to multiple servers, thus allows the system to track the user's connection information when the user visits different information sources over the network.¹⁷

The Applicants respectfully disagree. The arguments made above apply here as well. Claim 1 being allowable, Claim 13 must also be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 15, 16, 18, 23, and 36-49

Claims 15 and 36-46 are means-plus-function claims corresponding to method claims 1-13. Claim 16 is a means-plus-function claim corresponding to method claim 13. Claim 23 is an *In re Beauregard* claim corresponding to method claim 1. Claims 18 and 47-49 are apparatus claims corresponding to method claims 1-12. Claims 1-12 being allowable, Claims 15, 16, 18, 23, and 36-49 must also be allowable.

¹⁷ Office Action, pp. 7-10.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.


The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID BROWN
RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP

Dated: April 25, 2007



John P. Schaub
Reg. No. 42,125

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040